

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR PAPYROLOGIE UND EPIGRAPHIK

herausgegeben

von

*Helmut Engelmann, Dieter Hagedorn, Rudolf Kassel
Ludwig Koenen und Reinhold Merkelbach*



BAND 28

1978

RUDOLF HABELT VERLAG GMBH · BONN

P.ERL. 52 B Recto: A REEDITION

One of the more interesting, and neglected, texts for the history of the beginning of the fifteen-year indiction cycles is P.Erl.52, an account of various commodities disbursed for official purposes. The first edition presents numerous difficulties, and the preservation of parts of the text is poor. We have been led by our study of the indiction system¹⁾ to examine P.Erl.52 more closely on the basis of photographs kindly obtained by Professor J.Herrmann. From these we present a revised text and translation of the best-preserved part of the papyrus, B Recto, and a list of some corrections to the text of other parts of the papyrus.²⁾

Column I

23	κ[ρέ]ως [] λί(τραι) / βχνα
24	οὕτως	
25	μη(νὶ) Μαίων [Κ]ορνηλίω Μώρου εἰς Τ[εντ]ύραν ἀπὸ κ ^α ἰνδικ(τίονος) λί(τραι) ψ[ς]	
26	λοιπ(αὶ) εἰς τὴν πρὸ α ^α Καλ(ανδῶν) Μαίων ὑπατείας Οὐβολουσιανοῦ καὶ Ἀννιανοῦ	
27	τῶν λαμπροτάτων	λί(τραι) / Αἰμε
28	οὕτως	
29	κ ^α ἰνδικ(τίονος) π(αρά) Κορνηλίω Μώρου	λί(τραι) υμη
30	λογοθεσίου ιη ^α ἰνδικ(τίονος) π(αρά) Παῶτι Πχοταπῆτος καὶ κοι(ωνοῖς)	
31	ποιμέσι κώμης Πτύτews	λί(τραι) υια ὁμ(οίως)
32	λογοθεσίου ιζ ^α ἰνδικ(τίονος)	λί(τραι) / Απς
33	οὕτως	
34	π(αρά) Ἰσχυρίωνι Κασιανοῦ	λί(τραι) υ
35	π(αρά) Νεφώτῃ Διοσηόρου καὶ κοι(ωνοῖς) μέναι)	λί(τραι) χπς γ(ίνονται) αἱ π(ροκεί-

1) The results of this study will be embodied in our forthcoming Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt, in Studia Amstelodamensia.

2) It should be pointed out that A and B join exactly.

- 36 κριθῆς (ἀρτάβαι) ψζ γ̄ ιο̄
 37 οὕτως
 38 α' ἰνδικ(τίονος)
 39 διαδόταις ἐπὶ τόπων Οὐαλεντίνω καὶ Μάρκω (ἀρτάβαι) σλ β̄ η̄
 40 οὕτως
 41 κ'' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτ.) ρπςL ιζ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτ.) μδ δ̄ η̄ο̄
 42 ὑποδέχεται τοῦ νομοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐπὶ τόπ(ων) χορηγίας (ἀρτ.) κζL
 43 οὕτως
 44 κ'' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτ.) θ ζ'' ιζ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτ.) ιη γ''
 45 εἰς δὲ Τεντύραν ἀπὸ ιζ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτ.) ν γ(ίνονται) αἱ π(ροκείμεναι)
 46 γί(νονται) μεταβ... (ἀρτ.) τη d η̄ο̄
 47 λοιπ(αὶ) (ἀρτ.) τρϑ[η]'

Column II

- 48 οὕτ[ως]
 49 κ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτάβαι) [] λ̄ ζ̄
 50 ιθ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτάβαι) ι γ''
 51 ιη' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτάβαι) μη L δ''
 52 ιζ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτάβαι) ρπθ η̄ο̄
 53 γ(ίνονται) αἱ π(ροκείμεναι)
 54 ἀχύρου λι(τρῶν) (μυριάδες) ια / Θ̄σ̄..
 55 οὕτως
 56 εἰς Μαξιμιανόπολ(ιν) λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) η / Θ̄..δ̄
 57 οὕτως
 58 Κτίστη Κοπρήτος γ(ίνονται) αἱ π(ροκείμεναι)
 59 Ἰανουαρίῳ ἀπὸ λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) θ̄ μετὰ
 60 τὰς οὐσας α' ἰνδικ(τίονος) λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) β / ΗΞ αἱ
 61 λοιπ(αὶ) λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) ς / Ελμ
 62 οὕτως
 63 κ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) <λί(τραι)> / Δφ ιη'' ἰνδικ(τίονος)
 64 λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) ε / Ζυμ
 65 Πασμητ() ἀπὸ Ἐλεφαντίνης

66 ἀπὸ ιη' ἰνδικ(τίονος) ἀπὸ λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) β' μετὰ τὰς
 67 οὐσας α' ἰνδικ(τίονος) λ[ι](τρῶν) (μυρ.) α' ὡς αἰ
 68 λοιπ(αἰ) λί(τραι) / Θρμδ
 69 Ψενπνῆχθι ναυκλήρω
 70 ἀπὸ λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) β' Ε μετὰ τὰς οὐσας
 71 α' ἰνδικ(τίονος) λί(τρας) / ςφ αἰ λοιπ(αἰ) λι(τρ.) (μυρ.) α' Ηφ γ(ίνονται) αἰ
 π(ροκεῖμεναι)
 72 λοιπ(αἰ) λογοθ(εσίου) ιη' ἰνδικ(τίονος) π(αρά) ὑποδέχταις
 73 τοῦ νομοῦ λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) γ σ
 35 Uncertain if papyrus has κοιν, κοι or κοιν[ω()] 52 ρθ: ρ ex u

23. Possibly, as in 36, nothing was written in this line between κρέως and the amount.

25. The editor did not understand $\mu\eta' = \mu\eta(\nu\acute{\iota})$, and he therefore rejected his own correct suggestion of Μαῖω(ν).

31. There is a line under the end of ποιμέσι and the start of κώμης.

35. For γ(ίνονται) αἰ π(ροκεῖμεναι) see H.C.Youtie, *Scriptiunculae I* (Amsterdam 1973) 54 with other references. The editor (35n.) suggested this resolution but rejected it, evidently not understanding its use at the end of an account where the total is given at the top and then analyzed.

38. This line was apparently added between the lines as a supplement to διαδό-
ταις in the next line.

46. The editor's μεταβολεῖ has no sense in this place. We expect a form, pro-
bably passive, of μεταβάλλω, cf. line 7 of A Recto.

47. The editor places λοιπ(αἰ) in the preceding line, but this gives no sense, as the figure in 47 is in fact the balance, while 46 is the total of the figures above. The word is not really quite aligned with either line.

48. It is possible that the papyrus is virtually complete at top and that no text is lost (also in Column I). In this case it would be likely that lines 49ff. give a breakdown of line 47. But mutilation of the amounts makes it impossible to be certain.

54. The editor failed to recognize \wedge as the sign for myriads, but transcribed it as pi throughout, leading to grave problems in understanding the arithmetic.

58. There is a marginal stroke next to this line.

72. λογοθέσιον, absent from LSJ and WB, is cited by WB Supplement from this papyrus and from P.Oxy.XVIII 2187.9, where the editor translates it "audit of the accounts". Daris, Spoglio, adds PSI VII 767.49.

Translation

Column I

Meat

2,651 lbs.

As follows:

In the month of May, to Cornelius son of Moros, to Tentyra, from the 20th indiction 7[06] lbs.
Balance on Ante I Kal.May in the consulate of Volusianus and Annianus the most illustrious 1,945 lbs.

As follows:

20th indiction, with Cornelius son of Moros 448 lbs.
From the audit of the 18th indiction, with Paos son of Pchotapes and associates, 411 lbs.
shepherds of the village of Ptytis
Likewise, from the audit of the 17th indiction 1,086 lbs.

As follows:

With Ischyron son of Kasianos 400 lbs.
With Nephotes son of Dioskoros and associates 686 lbs.
The preceding sums agree.

Barley

707 $1/3$ $1/12$ art.

As follows:

To the local diadotai of the 1st indiction, Valentinus and Marcus 230 $2/3$ $1/8$ art.
As follows:

20th indiction 186 $1/2$ art.
17th indiction 44 $1/4$ $1/24$ art.
To the hypodektai of the nome, for local provisions 27 $1/2$ art.

As follows:

20th indiction 9 $1/6$ art.
17th indiction 18 $1/3$ art.
To Tentyra from the 17th indiction 50 art.
The preceding sums agree.
Total transferred (?) 308 $1/4$ $1/24$ art.
Balance 399 $[1/8]$ art.

Column II

As follows:

20th indiction [.]30 $1/6$ art.
19th indiction 10 $1/3$ art.
18th indiction 48 $1/2$ $1/4$ art.
17th indiction 189 $1/24$ art.

The preceding sums agree.

Chaff

119, 2[.] lbs.

As follows:

To Maximianopolis

89, [..]4 lbs.

As follows:

To Ktistes son of Kopres

The preceding sums agree.

To Ianuarius, from 90,000 lbs. after the sums from the 1st indiction, 28,060 lbs.,
the balance 65,940 lbs. [sic]

As follows:

20th indiction

4,500 lbs.

18th indiction

57,440 lbs.

To Paset () from Elephantine, from the 18th indiction, from 20,000 lbs., after the
amount from the 1st indiction, 10,856 lbs., balance 9,144 lbs.

To Psenpnechthis the naukleros, from 25,000 lbs., after the amount from the 1st in-
diction, 6,500 lbs., balance 18,500 lbs. The preceding sums agree.

Balance from the audit of the 18th indiction with the hypodektai of the nome, 30,200 lbs.

A brief explanation of the addition may be useful in the case of doubtful points.

Lines 23-35, meat: the basic sum is line 25 + line 27 = line 23 ($706 + 1945 = 2,651$). The figure of 1,945 is reckoned as follows: lines 34 + 35 = line 32 ($400 + 686 = 1,086$); lines 32 + 29 + 31 = line 27 ($1,086 + 448 + 411 = 1,945$).

Lines 36-47, barley: the basic sum is $47 + 46 = 36$ ($399 \frac{1}{8} + 308 \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{24} = 707 \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{12}$). Line 46 is reached by adding lines 39, 42 and 45 ($230 \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{8} + 27 \frac{1}{2} + 50 = 308 \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{24}$). Line 39 is the addition of two sums in line 41, and line 42 is the addition of two sums in line 44.

Lines 54-73, chaff: some figures are lost, making a complete reconciliation impossible. Lines 60 + 61 must = 59, but the scribe incorrectly wrote an epsilon instead of alpha in the thousands' place in line 61; that alpha was right is shown by adding 63 to 64 ($4,500 + 57,440$). Perhaps alpha was misread as epsilon from an account on which the figures originally stood. Line 66 less line 67 = line 68. Line 70 less line 71 = line 71 (18,500). Lines 61, 68 and 71 add up to 89,584, evidently what should have stood in line 56 (we cannot say if it actually did). Line 54 minus line 56 = line 73, but uncertainty in the last digits in lines 54 and 56 makes the exact sum (and the accuracy of the reckoning) uncertain.

This account has numerous points of interest. Here we are concerned with only one, the mentions of indictions. There are mentions of the 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, and 1st indictions. The first four of these are certainly, since we have a clear date by consuls in line 4 of 30 April 314, the indictions of 308/9 through 311/2. The usage of such numbers was demonstrated by Kase,³⁾ who remarked that these numbers equal the regnal

3) P.Princ.Roll, pp.26-27.

years of Galerius, the senior emperor at the time. We reserve a discussion of the problems concerning this style of reckoning to our forthcoming monograph.

The 1st indiction is the most recent, evidently (lines 38, 39, 60, 70, 71), and its harvest has already taken place. The entire account mentions only one expenditure after this date, in May (line 25), and we think it is a fair deduction from the fact that the last balance cited is that of 30 April that the account itself was drawn up in or shortly after May, 314. It is evident that indiction 1 in this context can be only the 1st indiction of the cycle of 312, i.e. 312/3. It is natural enough that indiction 2, 313/4, is not mentioned, for its harvest fell in 314 itself; the taxes would not begin to be paid, and the revenues thus be used for expenditures, until shortly after the time to which we assign this account, i.e. the harvest season of indiction 2 in 314. No mention of an indiction 2 is thus to be expected.⁴⁾

The broader significance of the evidence of P.Erl. 52 will be treated in our monograph on chronology. But it is important to point out that this is the only evidence known so far mentioning indiction 1 of the first cycle in a document. From P.Erl. 52 we can therefore deduce that by spring, 314, the authorities in Egypt were using the cycle of consecutively numbered indictions based on 312/3 = year 1, and that this system was used with reference not only to the current year but with regard to the past one. At all events, by May or June, 314, the cycle was in use with respect to the time since 312.

The other columns of this papyrus might also benefit from a reedition; and indeed P. Erl. 105 - 110, which clearly come from the same source and are closely related, could also use work. The photographs are not sufficiently clear to permit this at present, and recourse to the originals, not throughout well preserved, will be needed. For the present, we give a list of corrections to the remainder of P.Erl. 52 which can be made from the photographs. (X → Y means "for X read Y".)

P.Erl. 52 A Recto

Line 3: $\text{Ιχνη γὰρ} \rightarrow \text{Ι.} \text{ / Ηφ γ(ίνονται) αἱ προκείμεναι}$

4: This line is heavily mutilated, but there seems space enough in the lacuna to restore the name at least of the second consul: $[\kappa\alpha\iota \text{ Πρόβου}]$

4) Cl. Préaux, Cd'E 18 (1943) 169 pointed out that this papyrus contained a clear mention of the 1st indiction of 312/3, but her remarks have not been noticed by subsequent scholars, so far as we have seen.

5: λι(τραι) πγ σ → λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) γ σ, cf. lines 54ff.

6: γαι' → γ(ίνονται) αἱ π(ροκείμεναι)

7: Ἀππωνίου → ἀννωνικοῦ

9:]θασίου → λογο]θεσίου

10: ἰνδικ[τίονος] χορη → ἰνδικ(τίονος) [εἰς τὰς] ἐπὶ τόπων χορη|-[γίας]

19:].λογου →]. λογοθ(εσίου)

P.Erl. 52 A Verso

Above the middle, one reads, in the same hand as B Verso, three lines:

Βορήσεως (cf. B Verso)

Παχών

P.Erl. 52 B Verso

Line 78: Ψενεπ[ιμ]ιος → Ψενετύμιος

80: τοῦ θυ() → Τέχθ(ω)

ζ ρζL' → (τάλαντα) ιζS

82: (τάλαντον) αL επ → (τάλαντον) α (δραχμαὶ) Δπ

91: (τάλαντα) βξβ → (τάλαντα) β (δραχμαὶ) Β

93: Ἀ[σ]ιῆτος → Ἀτρῆτος

The numerals in lines 80 and 81 refer, in our opinion, to pag̃i.

Columbia University
University of Amsterdam

Roger S. Bagnall
K.A. Worp